- filing a complaint in the San Diego Superior Court, SDSC Case No. 37-2007-00065725-CU-PO-CTL, against ABI ("Complaint No. 1").
- 3. On July 23, 2007, ABI filed an Answer to Complaint No. 1 in San Diego Superior Court and on July 27, 2008, ABI filed a Notice of Removal to Federal Court on the basis of

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 5. On February 22, 2008, Plaintiff filed a lawsuit against the United States of America ("USA"), Case No. 08cv0350 BEN (POR) ("Complaint No. 2").
- 6. On or about April 22, 2008, the USA filed an Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint No. 2.
- 7. On or about May 7, 2008, all parties filed a Motion to Consolidate the aforementioned cases and stipulated to stay discovery proceedings until the cases were consolidated. The parties also requested that the Court modify the Original CMC so that the USA had sufficient time to conduct discovery.
- 8. On May 8, 2008, Judge John. A. Houston consolidated the cases, designating them under a joint caption as Case No. 08cv350 JAH (RBB). Judge Houston did not however address the discovery issues and deferred the scheduling and discovery to Judge Brooks. The parties agreed to stay discovery until the Original CMC could be modified.
- 9. On June 6, 2008, this Court held an Early Neutral Evaluation Conference and settlement conference in the consolidated case. At said conference, Plaintiff and Defendants requested that the Original CMC be amended.
- 10. On June 6, 2008, the Court entered an Amended Case Management Conference Order Regulating Discovery and Other Pre-Trial Proceedings ("Amended CMC Order").
- 11. Pursuant to the Amended CMC Order the defendants are required to designate their respective experts in writing and provide written report, as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(A) and (B), by September 2, 2008 and all parties are required to supplement its designation in response to the other party's designation no later than September 16, 2008.
- 12. The Amended CMC Order also provides that all written discovery shall be served no later than August 1, 2008 and that the parties complete discovery on or before October 3, 2008.

- 13. All parties have served written discovery, however responses to some discovery is pending.
- 14. ABI served the USA, *via mail*, interrogatories, requests for production of documents and requests for admission on August 1, 2008. Responses are due on or before September 3, 2008 (one day after expert reports are due).
- 15. Plaintiff also served request for admissions on ABI and USA on August 1, 2008 via personal service, with responses due August 31, 2008 (two days before expert reports are due)
- 16. The depositions of four of the USA employees/former employee are noticed for September 10, 2008 and September 11, 2008.
- 17. A site inspection of the subject premises is scheduled for September 25, 2008 at 10:00 a.m. and Plaintiff and ABI are working with the USA to coordinate this inspection as the subject premises is located on the San Diego Naval Base.
- 18. The parties are also in the process of coordinating a joint defense medical examination of Plaintiff, which the earliest possible date of said examination could not occur until Mid-September.
- 19. On August 26, 2008, I contacted counsel for the USA and Plaintiff's counsel by phone and email to: (a) request consent to an extension of time for expert disclosures, reports and related discovery and (b) inform them that in the event they failed to consent, Plaintiff would bring this ex parte application. Counsel for Plaintiff was unavailable and I left a message for him. Counsel for the USA agreed to extend the time and agreed on a proposed schedule with respect to same.
- 20. On August 27, 2008, I attempted to contact Plaintiff's counsel *via email*, informing him that counsel for USA had agreed to an extension and informing him of the reasons why ABI and USA requested said extension. There was no response.
- 21. On August 28, 2008, I attempted *for a third time* to contact counsel for Plaintiff. Plaintiff's counsel was reached and proposed that the parties push all the remaining discovery dates back until after the October 6, 2008 settlement conference. I informed him that a meaningful settlement conference could not be held at this point in time without having concluded the pending discovery. I called and emailed plaintiff's counsel requesting, once again,

whether he was willing to extend the discovery deadlines and received no response. All parties are aware of ABI's intent to bring this motion and have been informed 22. that ABI planned to file this motion if all parties did not agree to extend the discovery deadlines, as proposed. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this Declaration was executed on August 28, 2008. /s/ Samantha Lopez SAMANTHA LOPEZ 

INTERNATIONAL PRACTICE GROUP